speak the same language with himself — a disadvantage and a mark of inferiority, in truth, but not so severe as to deserve capital punishment.

And the women have found a voice, too, and they prefer to keep the husband and boys at home. They always did, but no one cared in the old days whether they liked it or not. It was a woman's fate and if her heart broke there was no help for it. Now she is discovering her power, and when she does that she uses it.

"Since when, Madame," said Napoleon in anger to a lady who ventured to hold and express opinions, "since when have women taken to meddling in politics?" "Since men have taken to cutting off women's heads, your majesty," was the reply.

Then comes in the school master. His life is hard and his pay is small, but he holds the sceptre in the new order of things. With his pen and pencil, his ferule and his spelling book he is the deadly, uncompromising foe that war must perforce succumb to. He teaches men to think, and therefore to avoid brutality and destruction. He teaches them wisdom when he teaches them how to spell, and drops the seed of charity in their hearts when he tells them from history how the human race has suffered. When they are taught that the highest office of civilization is to settle differences between men by peaceful devices, they begin to wonder why the practices that are so precious on a small scale should lose their virtue by extension, when they might be made of inestimable value. The learner asks himself why his life should pay forfeit to a monarch's caprice or to a sentimental resentment for wrongs that have slept years in their grave.

THE AMERICAN EXAMPLE.

And above all he may turn his eyes to the example of our people. He will then learn how a great and gallant nation may submit international differences to the same just and careful scrutiny as more private disputes. He will see a nation second to none in power and wealth and manly spirit ever ready to lay aside passionate and dangerous resentments to do and to accept what is just and right. The reader of our history knows how earnestly, with few exceptions, our leaders have sought to promote peace and good will among men. The bloodless triumphs which the United States has gained in the domain of international arbitration are more brilliant and more honorable than many victories in war. They exhibit the triumph of good sense, the love of justice, the manliness of self-control, and they challenge the admiration of mankind. The world is not yet attuned to the harmonies of peace. Sudden complications, unexpected affronts working upon the hot blood of an excited people may yet arouse the thirst for blood and the inborn tendency to destroy, but the danger of this grows more remote every day of peace. Men will learn that war settles nothing but the comparative strength of the contestants, and not always that. War never yet solved any real question. It takes from the weak something and gives it to the strong, boundaries are fixed without reference to the wishes of those most interested, rulers are changed, men are killed, towns destroyed, and debt piled up, but the question that brought about the struggle is often forgotten and never settled. Our own people went to war some eighty years ago in order that the question of impressment might be tried and adjudicated. The war lasted three years and when the treaty of peace was made the original cause of dissension was not mentioned. And to cap the climax of absurdity the greatest battle of the war was fought while the treaty was making its short journey across the Atlantic. The nations had made peace and had not found it out.

CASES ARBITRATED.

On the other hand, on nearly fifty occasions have the United States decorously submitted differences with other nations to arbitration. Thomas Jefferson was a believer in arbitration and so was General Grant. But greater than the influence of either or both these men, public opinion in our country has decided against the costly and senseless methods of war. We are the pioneers and have done gallant service to the cause of the world's happiness. Be sure that we have not toiled in vain and that the example we have set will lead mankind to better and greater things than it has yet known.

THE UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

By Professor John Bassett Moore, Columbia College, New York City.

I.—ARBITRATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.

In the conduct of its foreign relations, the Government of the United States has exerted a potent influence upon the development of international law. In the early dawn of its existence, when the rights of neutrals were little respected, Mr. Jefferson, as Secretary of State under Washington, announced for its guidance certain rules of neutral duty so broad and progressive that succeeding generations have not outgrown them. By persistent effort it has secured a wide recognition of the right of expatriation. It has also contributed to the establishment of the system of extradition. But it is not the least of its achievements that it has so constantly lent the weight of its influence and example to the substitution of reason for force in the adjustment of disputes among nations that international arbitration may be said to have been a prominent feature of its policy.

The main purpose of this paper is to present, as briefly as possible, a general view of the arbitrations of the United States, and of their subjects, forms of constitution, and results. This the writer has been enabled to do by a study of their history and proceedings, for the most part unpublished, which he hopes hereafter to make available.

The first trial by the United States of the method of arbitration was made under the treaty with Great Britain of 1794, commonly called the Jay Treaty, which by its fifth, sixth, and seventh articles, respectively, provided for three mixed commissions. That under the fifth article was organized to settle a dispute as to what river was intended under the name of the River St. Croix, which was specified in the Treaty of Peace of 1783 as forming part of our northeastern boundary. This Commission was composed of three members, each Government appointing one, and these two choosing a third. The first meeting was held at Halifax, August 30, 1796, and in order to attend it the American commissioner was forced to hire a vessel specially to transport him from Boston to Halifax, since no commercial intercourse was at the time allowed between the United States and British North America in American bottoms, and there was risk of interruption by hostile cruisers if he sailed in a British vessel, Great Britain being then at war with

France. The Commissioners rendered an award at Providence, R. I., October 25, 1798, holding that the Schoodiac was the river intended under the name of the St. Croix.

The commission under the sixth article of the Jay Treaty was organized to determine the compensation due to British subjects in consequence of impediments which certain of the United States had, in violation of the provisions of the Treaty of Peace, interposed to the collection of bona fide debts by British creditors. This commission, which was composed of five members, two appointed by each Government, and the fifth designated by lot, met in Philadelphia in May, 1797. The last meeting was held July 31, 1798, when the American commissioners withdrew. Besides diversities of opinion on questions of law, the discussions at the board developed personal feeling, which was constantly inflamed by Mr. Macdonald, one of the British commissioners, who made it a point of duty freely to express all his opinions. The final rupture was caused by his submitting an unnecessary resolution which declared that from the beginning of the Revolution down to the Treaty of Peace the United States, whatever may have been their relations to other powers, stood to Great Britain in an attitude of rebellion. As it has always been held by the United States to be unquestionable that the Treaty of Peace did not grant their independence, but merely recognized it as a condition existing from the 4th of July, 1776, the date of its declaration, the American commissioners regarded the resolution as gratuitously offensive. Nevertheless, when, a few days after their withdrawal, they sent a statement of their motives to their former British colleagues, the latter began their reply by saying: "We had yesterday the honor of receiving your letter of fifty-five pages." And a further response, evidently designed to be still more sarcastic, began: "Your suspension of our official business having left us at leisure for inferior occupations, we have again perused your long letter of the 2d instant." Both these communications were doubtless drawn by Mr. Macdonald, since they bear the impress of his style and are chiefly devoted to a vindication of his conduct. The claims which the commission failed to adjust were settled by a treaty concluded January 8, 1802, under which the British Government accepted the sum of £600,000 in satisfaction of its demands.

But the most important as well as the most interesting of the commissions under the Jay Treaty was that which sat at London under the seventh article. The American commissioners were Christopher Gore and William Pinkney; the British commissioners, John Nicholl, an eminent civilian, afterward succeeded by Maurice Swabey, and John Anstey; the fifth commissioner, chosen by lot, was Jonathan Trumbull, who had accompanied Mr. Jay to England when he negotiated the treaty. In order to avoid the misfortune of having a partisan as fifth commissioner, the four appointive members of the board adopted a happy expedient. In accordance with the requirements of the treaty, they first endeavored to select a fifth commissioner by agreement, and for that purpose each side presented a list of four persons; but as neither side would yield, it became necessary to resort to the alternative of casting lots. The next step, according to common practice, would have been for each side to place in the urn a name of its own independent selection, with the chances in favor of his being a partisan. But at London each side selected its name from the list of four made out by the other with a view to a mutual agreement, and the result was that a well-disposed man became the fifth commissioner.

One of the first questions raised before the commission was that of its power to determine its own jurisdiction in respect of the several claims presented for its decision. The British commissioners denied the existence of the power, and absented themselves from the board, till Lord Chancellor Loughborough, to whom the question was submitted, declared "that the doubt respecting the authority of the commissioners to settle their own jurisdiction was absurd, and that they must necessarily decide upon cases being within or without their competency."

Important questions of law arose before the board in relation to contraband, the rights of neutrals, and the finality of the decisions of prize courts. These were all discussed with masterly ability, especially by Mr. Pinkney. His opinions as a member of the board Mr. Wheaton pronounced to be "finished models of judicial eloquence, uniting powerful and comprehensive argument with a copious, pure, and energetic diction." And they are almost all we possess, in a complete and authentic form, of the legal reasoning of the only advocate to whom, so far as we are informed, Chief Justice Marshall ever paid the tribute of an enthusiastic encomium in a formal opinion of the Supreme Court. The sessions of the board were brought to a close Feb. 24, 1804, all the business before it having been completed. It was, however, in actual session only part of the period its existence nominally covers. Besides other interruptions, there was an entire suspension of its proceedings from July 30, 1799, to Feb. 15, 1802, pending the diplomatic adjustment of the difficulty caused by the breaking up of the commission at Philadelphia.

Beginning with the arbitrations under the Jay treaty, every vexatious question between the United States and Great Britain that has since arisen, except the extraordinary complications growing out of the Napoleonic wars and leading up to the war of 1812, has yielded to methods of peace, arbitration being adopted where direct negotiation failed.

Like the Jay Treaty, the Treaty of Ghent, of Dec. 24, 1814, which restored amity between the two countries, provided for three arbitrations. The first, under article 4, related to certain islands in Passamaquoddy Bay, the title to which, it was stipulated, should be determined by two persons, one appointed by each Government; and it was provided that, if they should disagree, the points of difference should be referred to a friendly sovereign or state. The commissioners held their first meeting at St. Andrews, New Brunswick, Sept. 23, 1816, and at their last, in the city of New York, Nov. 24, 1817, they rendered a final award.

By the fifth article of the Treaty of Ghent, an arbitration similar in constitution to that under article 4 was provided for the ascertainment of the northeastern boundary of the United States from the source of the river St. Croix, along a certain described course, to the river St. Lawrence. The commission under this article held its first meeting at St. Andrews Sept. 23, 1816, and its last in the city of New York April 13, 1822. Failing to agree, the commissioners made separate reports to their Governments, and, by a convention concluded Sept. 29, 1827, the points of difference were referred to the King of the Netherlands. His award, dated Jan. 10, 1831, the two Governments agreed to waive, since it assumed to make a new line in place of that described in the treaties.

The third commission under the Treaty of Ghent was organized under articles 6 and 7. Under the sixth article, its duty was to determine the northern boundary of the United States along the middle of the Great Lakes and of their communications by water to the water communication between Lakes Huron and Superior; and under the seventh article, to determine the line from that point to the most northwestern point of the Lake of the Woods. This commission was composed of two members, one appointed by each Government. On June 18, 1822, they reached an agreement under article 6; but on the line described in article 7 they failed to concur, and it was finally determined, as was the unsettled boundary under article 5, by the treaty of Aug. 9, 1842, generally known as the Webster-Ashburton Treaty.

In this relation it may be stated that the boundary from the northwest angle of the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains, on the forty-ninth parallel of latitude, under the treaty of 1846, was determined by a joint commission, of which the American member was appointed under an act of Congress of March 19, 1872.

By the first article of the Treaty of Ghent it was agreed that all territory, places and possessions taken by either party from the other during the war, or after the signing of the peace, should, with the exception of the disputed islands in Passamaquoddy Bay, the title to which was to be determined by arbitration, be restored without delay, and without the destruction or carrying away of any public property, or of any slaves or other private property. Differences having arisen as to Great Britain's performance of the obligation touching slaves, it was agreed by the fifth article of the treaty of Oct. 20, 1818, to refer the dispute to the Emperor of Russia. On April 22, 1822, the Emperor decided that Great Britain had failed to keep her obligation and must make indemnity, and on the 12th of the ensuing July a convention was concluded under his mediation for the appointment of a commission to determine the amount to be paid. This commission was composed of a commissioner and an "arbitrator" appointed by each Government—four persons in all; but the two commissioners were first to examine the claims and endeavor to reach a decision, and, if they failed to agree, then to draw by lot, in each case of divergence, the name of one of the "arbitrators" to decide between them. This repetitious choice of an umpire by lot was not likely to promote consistency of decision; but the two commissioners, having met on Aug. 25, 1823, succeeded by Sept. 11, 1824, in agreeing on an average value for slaves taken from each State or district, and they subsequently concurred on other points. They held their last session March 26, 1827, their functions having been terminated by the ratification of a convention concluded at London Nov. 13, 1826, under which Great Britain paid $1,204,960 in full settlement of all the claims.

As we have already mentioned the reference of the northeastern boundary dispute to the King of the Netherlands, under the convention of 1827, we come now to the convention concluded at London, February 8, 1853, for a general settlement of claims pending between the United States and Great Britain. Under this convention each Government appointed a commissioner, and the two commissioners chose an umpire. This responsible post was first offered to ex-President Van Buren, who declined it, and then to Joshua Bates, an American, but a member of the house of the Barings, who accepted the trust and faithfully discharged it. Many important decisions were pronounced by this commission, some of which touched our rights in the fisheries adjacent to the northeast coasts of British North America. It also rendered awards in the famous cases of McLeod and the brig *Creole*. Its first session was held in London, September 15, 1853; its last, January 15, 1855.

By the treaty between the United States and Great Britain of June 5, 1854, in relation to Canadian fisheries and commerce, provision was made for the adjustment of any disputes as to the exclusive right of British fishermen under the treaty, by a commission to be composed of a person appointed by each government, and an umpire.

Ten years lacking a week after the adjournment of the commission under the convention of 1853, a British-American commission, similar in constitution, met in Washington, under a convention concluded July 1, 1863, to determine the compensation due to the Hudson's Bay Company and the Puget's Sound Agricultural Company, two British organizations, on certain claims for damages, as well as for the transfer to the United States of all their property and rights in territory acknowledged by the treaty of 1846, in regard to limits west of the Rocky Mountains, to be under the sovereignty of that government. The commissioners, who met January 7, 1865, chose as umpire one of America's greatest judges and jurists, Benjamin Robbins Curtis; but his services were not required, since the commissioners on September 10, 1869, concurred in an award.

While this commission was sitting, the relations between the United States and Great Britain were seriously disturbed by controversies growing out of the civil war, the northeastern fisheries, and the disputed San Juan water boundary. All these menacing differences were composed by the treaty of Washington, of May 8, 1871, signed on the part of the United States by Hamilton Fish, Robert C. Schenck, Samuel Nelson, Ebenezer Rockwood Hoar, and George H. Williams; on the part of Great Britain, by the Earl de Grey and Ripon, Sir Stafford H. Northcote, Sir Edward Thornton, Sir John A. Macdonald, and Montague Bernard. The right of this treaty to be regarded as the greatest treaty of arbitration the world had yet seen was only emphasized by the fact that it provided for four distinct arbitrations, the largest number ever established under a single convention. Of the four arbitrations under the treaty of Washington, first in order and importance was that at Geneva, the noblest spectacle of modern times, in which two great and powerful nations, gaining in wisdom and self-control, and losing nothing in patriotism or self-respect, taught the world that the magnitude of a controversy need not be a bar to its peaceful solution. On the part of the United States, the arbitrator was Charles Francis Adams; on the part of Great Britain, Sir Alexander Cockburn There were three other arbitrators, Count Frederic Sclopis, Jacques Staempfli, afterward President of Swtz erland, and the Viscount D'Itajuba, respectfully desiignated by the King of Italy, the President of the Swiss Confederation and the Emperor of Brazil. The American agent was J. C. Bancroft Davis, the British agent, Lord Tenterden. Caleb Cushing, William M. Evarts, and Morrison R. Waite appeared as counsel for the United States. Sir Roundell Palmer, afterward Lord Selborne, appeared for Great Britain,

assisted by Mountague Bernard and Mr. Cohen. How celebrated the names both of those who negotiated and of those who executed the treaty! The demands presented by the United States to the tribunal, arising out of thd acts of Confederate cruisers of British origin, and genere ically known as the Alabama claims, were as follows:

1. Direct losses growing out of the destruction of vessels and their cargoes.
2. The national expenditures in pursuit of those cruisers.
3. The loss for the transfer of the American commercial marine to the British flag.
4. The enhanced payments of insurance.
5. The prolongation of the war, and the addition of a large sum to the cost of the war and the suppression of the rebellion.

As to classes 3, 4, and 5, Great Britain denied the jurisdiction of the tribunal, and also its power to decide as to its own competency, a question, as we have seen, raised by the same Government and determined against it under article 7 of the Jay Treaty. Without deciding this question, the Geneva tribunal disposed of these three classes by expressing an opinion that they did not, upon the principles of international law, constitute a good foundation for an award of compensation, and that they should be excluded from consideration, even if there were no difference between the two Governments as to the board's competency. In regard to the second class of claims, the tribunal held that they were not properly distinguishable from the general expenses of the war carried on by the United States; and further, by a majority of three to two, that no compensation should be awarded to the United States on that head. On claims of the first class, the tribunal awarded the sum of $15,500,000. Its first session was held December 15, 1871; its last, September 14, 1872.

The dispute as to the San Juan water boundary was referred to the Emperor of Germany, who rendered, October 21, 1872, an award in favor of the United States. Claims of British subjects against the United States, and of citizens of the United States against Great Britain (excepting the Alabama claims), arising out of injuries to persons or property during the civil war in the United States, from April 17, 1861, to April 9, 1865, were referred to a mixed commission, composed of three persons respectively appointed by the United States, Great Britain, and Spain, which sat in the United States. The fourth arbitration under the Treaty of Washington, to determine the compensation, if any, due to Great Britain for privileges accorded by that treaty to the United States in the northeastern fisheries, was conducted by a commission of three persons—a citizen of the United States, a British subject, and a Belgian—which met at Halifax, June 15, 1877, and on the 23d of the following November (the American commissioner dissenting) awarded Great Britain the sum of $5,500,000.

From France we have several times obtained gross sums in settlement of our claims by direct negotiation. The single exception to this practice is the commission, composed of an American, a Frenchman, and a citizen of a third power, which sat in Washington from November 5, 1880, to March 31, 1884, and determined the claims of citizens of France for injuries to their persons and property during our civil war, and claims of citizens of the United States against France for like injuries during the war between that country and Germany.

With Spain, our experience in respect to the settlement of claims has been similar to that with France; but in the case of Spain we have had two arbitrations. The first, under a diplomatic agreement of February 12, 1871, touching claims growing out of the insurrection in Cuba, was effected by means of a mixed commission, composed of two arbitrators, an American and a Spaniard, and an umpire, a citizen of a third power, which met in Washington, May 31, 1871. The arbitrators concluded their labors December 27, 1882; the last decision of the umpire bears date February 22, 1883. The second arbitration was the reference on February 28, 1885, to Baron Blanc, Italian minister at Madrid, of the question of the amount of damages to be paid by Spain for the admittedlv wrongful seizure and detention of the American bark *Masonic*.

With our neighbor Mexico we have had two arbitrations, by means of mixed commissions, for the adjustment of miscellaneous claims, some of which were of great magnitude and importance. The first commission, under the treaty of April 11, 1839, was composed of two American and two Mexican commissioners, and an umpire, a citizen of Prussia. One of the American commissioners was William L. Marcy, a remarkable man, in regard to whom the forgetfulness of the present generation is to be lamented. The second commission, under the treaty of July 4, 1868, consisted of a board of two commissioners and an umpire, and lasted from July 31, 1869, to November 20, 1876, but some of the umpire's decisions were rendered after the labors of the commissioners were completed. Francis Lieber at one time, and Sir Edward Thornton at another, served in the capacity of umpire. A thousand and seventeen claims were presented by the United States, and 998 by Mexico, and their aggregate amount exceeded half a billion dollars. The aggregate amount allowed was about four millions and a quarter; but it has been charged that two of the principal awards in favor of the United States were procured by fraudulent evidence, and, pending an investigation of this charge, the United States has suspended the distribution of the money paid by Mexico upon them.

Besides adjusting miscellaneous claims by arbitration, the United States and Mexico have adopted a notable arbitral measure in the convention of March 1, 1889, by which a permanent board, denominated an International Boundary Commission, is established for the determination of questions growing out of changes in the course of the Rio Grande and the Colorado rivers, where they form the boundary. This provision, however, is but the consummation of arbitral stipulations for determining the boundary which are found in the treaties between the two countries of January 12, 1828; February 2, 1848; December 30, 1853; and July 29, 1882.

The most remarkable, however, of all the arbitral agreements between the United States and Mexico is that found in the twenty-first article of the treaty of February 2, 1848, commonly called the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, to which, as a general obligation to arbitrate, all subsequent arbitral arrangements between the two countries may in a measure be referable. This article reads as follows:

If unhappily any disagreement should hereafter arise between the Governments of the two republics, whether with respect to the interpretation of any stipulation in this treaty, or with respect to any other particular concerning the political or commercial relations of the two nations, the said Governments, in the name of those nations, do promise to each other that they will endeavor, in the most sincere and earnest manner, to settle the differences so arising, and to preserve the state of peace and friendship in which the two countries are now placing themselves, using, for

this end, mutual representations and pacific negotiations. And if, by these means, they should not be enabled to come to an agreement, a resort shall not, on this account, be had to reprisals, aggressions, or hostility of any kind, by the one republic against the other, until the Government of that which deems itself aggrieved shall have maturely considered, in the spirit of peace and good neighborship, whether it would not be better that such difference should be settled by the arbitration of commissioners appointed on each side, or by that of a friendly nation. And should such course be proposed by either party, it shall be acceded to by the other, unless deemed by it altogether incompatible with the nature of the difference, or the circumstances of the case.

Let us hope that in committing themselves, as peculiarly befits neighboring and friendly states, to arbitration as a principle, the people of the United States and Mexico have adopted a policy which they will liberally extend to other nations.

The United States and Haiti have had three arbitrations. By a protocol signed May 24, 1884, they referred to the Hon. William Strong, formerly one of the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, two claims against Haiti, known as those of Pelletier and Lazare, involving questions of administrative and judicial precedure. The awards, dated June 13, 1885, were adverse to Haiti. But the United States has thus far declined to enforce them on the ground that in the case of Lazare the award was shown by alleged after discovered evidence, which the arbitrator himself declared to be material, to have been unjust; and that, in the case of Pelletier, the arbitrator erroneously conceived and declared himself to be compelled by the terms of the protocol to award, on a single question of strict law, compensation upon a claim which he obviously regarded as immoral and unjust.

On March 7, 1885, the American minister at Port au Prince and the Haitien minister of foreign affairs agreed upon a mixed commission of two Americans and two Haitiens to adjust the claims of citizens of the United States growing out of civil disturbances in the island. The labors of the commission were completed on the 24th of the following month.

While these claims were pending, the imprisonment of C. A. Van Bokkelen, a citizen of the United States, at Port au Prince for debt, and the decision by the Haitien courts that because he was an alien he could not obtain his liberty by an assignment for the benefit of his creditors, occasioned a dispute both as to the treaty guaranty of full legal rights to citizens of the one country in the jurisdiction of the other, and as to the finality of the denial by the Haitien tribunals of a claim of right made in virtue of an international obligation. Under a protocol signed May 22, 1888, Mr. Alexander Porter Morse, of the city of Washington, who was named as arbitrator, rendered December 4, 1888, an award adverse to Haiti and allowed the claimant suitable damages.

Only once have members of onr arbitral boards been charged with fraud. But the conduct of the claims commission at Caracas, under the convention of April 25, 1866, was so seriously impeached that the United States and Venezuela, by a treaty concluded December 5, 1885, agreed to have the claims reheard by a new commission. This commission, composed of an American, a Venezuelan, and a third commissioner chosen by the other two, who was also an American, sat at Washington from September 3, 1889, to September 2, 1890. Its proceedings were characterized by a conscientious and impartial discharge of duty.

With Colombia there have been three mixed commissions, each composed of two commissioners and an umpire. The first and second were organized under conventions concluded September 10, 1857, and February 10, 1864, and before both of them came important cases touching our rights on the Isthmus of Panama under the treaty with New Granada of 1846. The third commission, appointed under a diplomatic agreement of August 17, 1874, awarded the sum of $33,401 for the capture of the American steamer *Montijo* by insurgents In the State of Panama. For the adjustment of miscellaneous claims, we have also had two similarly constituted commissions with Peru under conventions of January 12, 1863, and December 4, 1868; one with Costa Rica, under the treaty of July 2, 1860, and one with Ecuador, under the treaty of November 25, 1862. Besides joining with Peru in mixed commissions, the United States by a convention concluded December 20, 1862, agreed to refer two claims against that Government for the seizure ard confiscation of the vessels *Georgiana* and *Lizzie Thompson* to the King of the Belgians. His Majesty, however, declined the trust, and on July 9, 1864, Mr. Seward, then Secretary of State, informed the Peruvian minister in Washington that the United States would not pursue the subject further.

TO BE CONTINUED.

AMONG THE MAGAZINES.

THE CENTURY.

The Anachronism of War.*

The traveller on the Riviera who rambles over the picturesque promontory of Monaco—that puny principality of six square miles, with a military band of 350 musicians and a standing army of 90 men—is struck with the ludicrousness of finding on its ramparts a lot of Spanish cannon of a past age, bearing the inscription, *Ultima ratio regum*—"The last argument of kings." To a man of reflection the sentiment seems as antiquated as the brass on which it is engraved. Not that war is a practical impossibility: even as we write the world seems to be born anew with wars or rumors of wars. The impossibility lies rather in the revolt of the mind against the retrogression in civilization which is implied by war, when there is at hand so potent, so tried, and so honorable a substitute as arbitration. With this short cut to justice in mind, it is inconceivable to a civilized man

* With permission of the Editor.